

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1761

was awarded the LL.B. degree in 1931. His interest in the study of law was to better enable him to carry on the work of the NAACP during his tenure as president.

He is the president of Broadway Federal Savings & Loan Association of Los Angeles, an institution with assets in excess of \$44 million. When Dr. Hudson assumed the presidency of the association in 1949, the association had assets of less than \$3 million.

In 1962, at Charter Day exercises, Dr. Hudson received the Distinguished Alumnus Award from his alma mater, Howard University, Washington, D.C. In 1963, he was given a distinguished citizens award from the county conference on community relations.

Dr. Hudson is a trustee of the Wesley Methodist Church and is a member of and active in many social, professional, and human relations organizations.

A Tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the gray skies and misting rain we have witnessed in Washington give sad expression to the sorrow we all feel as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the most vivid public servants of our age, lies in honored state under the dome of this Nation's Capitol.

It is a tribute reserved for the great of this country, and the greatness of Douglas MacArthur, a dedicated patriot of freedom, a brilliant military strategist, and a commander of our forces in three wars, was recognized long ago.

During the black hours of World War II, the rugged face, the tarnished hat, the determined look of self-assurance gave hope and confidence to a frightened world. His courage and strong sense of duty, honor and country gave inspiration and valor to the men he led in sacrificing service to this country and the cause of freedom. His own sense of duty is characterized by his uncompromising statement:

The man who will not defend his freedom does not deserve to be free.

MacArthur was a serious and eloquent man. His high sense of purpose and indomitable moral courage clung to him throughout a lifetime. After the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, when the Filipinos were left alone under cruel enemy occupation, it was to him a moral duty to return.

As Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo reminded us:

For him to say "I shall return" was to wave the flag of hope, of determination, of undying faith. The guerrillas in the swamps and in the mountains would continue fighting because MacArthur they were sure was coming back. The personal pronoun "I" was MacArthur. His word was his bond.

And MacArthur did return. With moral courage, and a genius for strategy, he led victorious troops across the Pacific into Japan.

Perhaps his great success as a military leader came from his genuine respect for the men he was called to lead. Of the American man of arms he said:

My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless * * *. In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his stature in the hearts of his people.

This respect that MacArthur held for the average foot soldier has been returned twofold, not only from those who served under him, but from the hearts of people throughout the world who esteem the example he set before us. We may not be able to express it in the same eloquent manner, but our feelings are as deep and as genuine.

General MacArthur was born to military life. The son of Arthur MacArthur, a lieutenant general and one of the outstanding figures of our Civil War, he learned well his lessons in patriotism and love of country. In 1899 he entered his beloved U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and the years spent there were among his dearest memories of a full lifetime.

Four years later he graduated as first in his class. From that point on, the fact that he was outstanding among men was seldom questioned. He became the youngest brigadier in the American Expeditionary Forces of the First World War. He was then made Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, again the youngest in history, and was retained for an unheard of second term under the directions of President Roosevelt.

Then came Pearl Harbor and the devastation of World War II. He was entrusted as supreme commander in the Pacific and brought exceptional leadership to the fight for freedom. He became, as President Johnson said, "one of the authentic American heroes of this century."

At the outbreak of the Korean conflict the free world turned to him as their supreme allied commander. His decision, made against great opposition, concerning the Inchon landing in Korea in 1950, proved to be a brilliant victory. Some historians have expressed the opinion that it may be among the greatest examples of military strategy in history. But MacArthur's dictum, that "There is no substitute for victory," brought him squarely in conflict with the leader of our country. After years of noble service to this Nation he was retired from active military life.

The words he spoke in that memorable and touching farewell speech to Congress point up the great moral courage of the man. He held a strong conviction and, in the face of what he considered to be disgrace—held on to it. It is not for us to judge who was right—future generations will do that for us—but those

closing lines expressed the dedication and the courage of an exceptional man, a man whose passing deeply grieves the world. Those lines were:

Now I close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goodby.

Land Reform in the Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the *Prairie Farmer* magazine of April 4 carries a timely, objective, and helpful comment on the war on poverty as it applies to American agriculture.

The text of the editorial points up the hazards of this aspect of the poverty proposal:

THE NEW CRUSADE: WAR ON POVERTY

We are now embarked on a crusade—a war on poverty. Someone has said that nothing is so irresistible as an idea whose time has come. The war on poverty is such an idea. Most of us want an end to the ignorance, stagnation, futility, and lowered self-esteem that goes with poverty.

But poverty is relative. People who today have running water, gas, electricity, telephone, television, automobile, and bathroom are being classed as poverty stricken. Yet we can remember when neither we nor our neighbors had any of these but never considered ourselves underprivileged.

We suspect that the poverty war has November political overtones. Critics ask if there are enough statistics to make clear what the problem is. For example, retired people with \$100,000 in the bank and \$3,000 income are classed with the poor who need help. The Labor Department says there are 6 million unemployed. But another authority says there are only 1 million hard-core unemployed, because the bulk of the unemployed are teenage dropouts, married women, and the sick and crippled who are unemployed.

At the recent Pure Milk Association meeting in Chicago we listened to two dairymen say that there is nothing tougher in the dairy business today than trying to get good, dependable help. Demand is also strong in business and industry for skilled workers.

Much as we sympathize with the problem of the unemployed and much as we commend the administration for deciding to do something about poverty, we hope they will not rush into this thing blindly. We would like to cite an example of one proposal we feel sure is heading for trouble.

In a speech before the National Farmers Union convention in St. Paul recently, Sargent Shriver, director of the poverty war, proposed that the Government put up the money to buy large tracts of farmland. This land would then, he said, be divided into small farms. Cash grants would be made to the poor families taking over these small tracts.

Size wasn't mentioned. But let's say poor families would be moved onto 40- or 80-acre tracts. It is doubtful that such land would be available in the fertile, high-priced prairies of the lower Midwest. About all that might be available would be in remote

April 9

A1762

areas like northern Wisconsin and the upper peninsula of Michigan.

This seems to be a harebrained idea lifted from land-reform programs proposed for backward countries. How would poor families with little or no capital handle such acreage? With a job in town, they could cut food costs. Without a town job—and we wonder where such jobs would be found in remote areas—they would starve. It would be uneconomic to invest in machinery for such a small acreage, and even if it weren't, where would they get the money to finance it? Then there are real estate taxes to pay. Schools and roads would be costly, so land taxes would be high.

Questioned about the futility of such a program, Shriver said: "If a poor family is only earning \$1,500 and we can raise it by this program to \$3,000 we will have accomplished a great deal." True enough, but we still would have little more than a rural slum or a form of rationed poverty.

The problem of poverty in country or city should be attacked with the tools of education and the incentives of opportunity. Shriver said, "Soon we will eliminate poverty completely from this land." If all men were thrifty and industrious, we would agree, but all men aren't.

So let's be sure we know where we are going before we start out on tangents like this. A thorough study by hardheaded, knowledgeable people would be a good place to start. Enough mistakes have been made in agricultural planning without adding another.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Texas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation mourns General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, we find ourselves united once more in shared sadness and reflection.

The lives of us all have been lifted by the force of this man's character.

We who live in Texas are glad that our State contributed to the formation of his life, as his life later contributed to ours.

As a boy in his teens, Douglas MacArthur spent in the State of Texas what he called in his memoirs, "the happiest days of my life." Later he served in Texas as a young officer in the Army of the United States.

General MacArthur recounts in his life story that his first memories are of a tour of duty his father Gen. Arthur MacArthur, served on the Rio Grande River at Fort Seldon near El Paso.

At 13, Douglas MacArthur was enrolled at the newly established West Texas Military Academy in San Antonio. There he achieved high scholastic standing and honors. He was quarterback of the football team and a tennis champion.

Writing of his years at the West Texas Military Academy near Fort Sam Houston, General MacArthur said:

It was here that a transformation began in my development. There came a desire to know, a seeking for the reasons why, a zest to learn the facts. Gradually an overwhelming thirst for knowledge seized me.

That the late General MacArthur regarded Texas with the same esteem with which the State of Texas and its people regard this great national hero is reflected in his words:

It was a wrench to leave San Antonio. My few years there were without a doubt the happiest of my life. Texas will always be a second home to me.

In Texas the past is important. The soldier whose body lies in state here today will be remembered.

The War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the crisis we face in southeast Asia continues to be one of the most serious problems confronting the free world. The chief of the Washington Bureau for the Gannett News Service, Paul Martin, has written an outstanding summary of the events that have led to the situation we face in that beleaguered area. We often overlook or forget the nature of events and decisions that lead to difficult situations. This is regrettable because we should learn from them. Mr. Martin has performed an outstanding service by recalling for all of us the major events and decisions that have led to the present crisis in Vietnam.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, April 6.—Of all the foreign problems confronting the United States around the world, the most baffling to the administration is the Communist guerrilla war in southeast Asia.

This is the longest continuing war of modern times. It has been going on intermittently for more than 20 years, or since the Japanese occupation in World War II of the former French colonies in Indochina, now known as Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.

Casualty reports show that 205 American soldiers have been killed in combat or service accidents in South Vietnam since the United States embarked on a stepped-up military assistance program in 1961.

Gen. Paul D. Harkins, Chief of the U.S. Military Mission, said 10,000 South Vietnamese were killed in combat during 1962. No later figures are available.

A dispatch from Saigon last November placed the strength of U.S. personnel in the country at 16,500 military and 3,500 civilians.

Military and economic assistance figures supplied to Congress show the continuing jungle warfare has cost American taxpayers \$5 billion in the last 10 years.

The current foreign aid program to South Vietnam is running at a level of \$600 million a year.

Between 1946 and 1954, when the United States supported France in a 7½-year losing war against the Communists in North Vietnam, the cost was more than \$3 billion.

The National Assembly in Paris was informed that the United States was paying 78 percent of the bill for the anti-Communist war in Indochina, or around \$1.5 billion a year.

The French claimed at the time of 1954 partition of Vietnam that they had suffered 253,000 casualties, including 92,000 killed,

114,000 wounded, and 28,000 prisoners. Communist losses were estimated at more than 200,000 dead.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have made four factfinding journeys to Saigon in the last 2 years in an effort to find a solution.

Henry Cabot Lodge, former U.N. Ambassador and 1960 Republican nominee for Vice President, was appointed by the late President Kennedy as U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam on June 27, 1963, in overall charge of the diplomatic, economic, and military effort.

During his tenure, there have been two changes of government in Saigon.

Ngo Dinh Diem was ousted as President in a military uprising November 1-2, 1963, in which 34 soldiers or civilians were killed and 236 wounded. Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were assassinated. Madame Nhu, on tour in America at the time, accused the United States of inciting and supporting the revolt, which placed a military junta in charge.

The military junta was overthrown in a bloodless coup last January 30 led by Gen. Nguyen Khanh who became the new Premier. Khanh charged on March 1 that French agents plotted to assassinate him, overthrow his regime, and join with Communists in imposing a "neutralist" settlement on Vietnam.

Communists took advantage of the confusion to increase their attacks on government-controlled strategic hamlets and communications in South Vietnam. They launched a new campaign of terrorism against Americans stationed in Saigon.

U.S. officials say that if South Vietnam were all that mattered, we could pull out. The country doesn't mean that much to us in trade or raw materials. Its principal exports are rice and rubber. Both are surplus in the United States, but would be of considerable value to the economy of Red China.

The country has a population of some 14 million, compared to 16 million in Communist North Vietnam. About 85 percent of the South Vietnamese are engaged in farming, and 70 percent of them are illiterate. They have a per capita income of around \$94 a year, and a gross national product of \$1.4 billion. The country is a food surplus area with a strategic location in southeast Asia.

Government officials claim that what is really at stake here is the prestige and power position of the United States throughout the entire Pacific.

If the Communists took over South Vietnam, they would turn the same tactics on Thailand, Malaysia and perhaps the Philippines. Next would come Burma, India and Japan. Alliance with the United States would become of dubious value in the Orient.

The essential problem is how to preserve the freedom and independence of the region, without becoming involved in a conventional war against the masses of Red China, or a general nuclear conflict over the rice paddies and steaming jungles of southeast Asia.

The following sequence of events illuminates the nature of the long and frustrating struggle:

YEARS 1941-48

During Gen. Douglas MacArthur's fight for the Pacific in World War II, the United States gave military aid to Ho Chi Minh, a Moscow-trained Communist and veteran Soviet agent, who led a native uprising against Japanese occupation forces in Vietnam.

When the French tried to regain their position in Indochina after the war, Ho seized power, proclaimed a "people's republic," and fired on Hanoi December 19, 1946, starting a civil war.

The United States provided military and economic assistance to French Union Forces for 7½ years. After the Communist conquest of the China mainland in 1949, Ho's followers were supplied from Red China.

IN 1954

The French were on the verge of collapse by 1954.

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in a supposedly "off-the-record" speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, said the United States would have to send troops to Vietnam, if there was no other way to prevent its fall to the Communists.

With the Korean war fresh in mind, Nixon's remarks raised a storm of protest in Congress and the press. Senator John F. Kennedy demanded that administration say whether "we are about to enter the jungle and do battle with the tiger." He urged "independence at once" for Indochina.

Former President Eisenhower told newsmen he was bitterly opposed to involving the United States in a hot war in Indochina. He claimed it would be a "terrible tragedy." Former Defense Secretary C. E. Wilson predicted a military victory was both possible and probable.

France, Britain, and the Soviet Union negotiated truce agreements at Geneva on July 21, supposedly ending the war by dividing Vietnam into a Communist North and a free South at the 17th parallel.

The United States refused to become a party to these agreements. Former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles warned that a Communist victory would lead to Red domination of all of southeast Asia, posing a grave threat to security of the entire Pacific.

Eisenhower said "the agreement contains features we do not like," but avoided calling it "appeasement." Adlai Stevenson termed it "A victory for communism," in which the United States "defaulted and France salvaged what she could."

Ho Chi Minh promised over Peiping radio to "liberate" the rest of Vietnam. He said the Communists would use the cease-fire to "adjust the military zones as the first step toward our final goal."

The State Department said in a 1961 documentary:

"Even as they were negotiating the Geneva accords . . . the Communists were making plans to take over all of Vietnam. Trained and well-disciplined party members were picked to remain in the south . . . arms and ammunition were cached in hundreds of carefully selected spots throughout South Vietnam."

YEARS 1955-60

Ngo Dinh Diem, a Roman Catholic and anti-Communist Nationalist, replaced the playboy emperor, Bao Dai, as leader of South Vietnam. Diem was hailed as a miracle man in pulling the country together.

The State Department said:

"When the republic of Vietnam was born in 1955, its economy was a shambles. Years of foreign occupation, wartime bombing, bitter fighting with the French, and internal battles with dissident elements had left confusion in their wake.

"The years 1956 to 1960 produced something of an economic miracle in South Vietnam . . . Prewar levels of production were achieved and passed . . . South Vietnam was outstripping the North in the same fashion that West Germany has exceeded achievements of the 'Socialist' East. The leaders in Hanoi could not accept that prospect."

In 1959 the Communists launched a campaign of terror against the people of South Vietnam, using torture and assassination.

"They killed hundreds of village chiefs and other local officials . . . schoolteachers, even wives and children, have been among the victims," the State Department reported. "It is a program that relies on every available

technique for spreading disorder in a peaceful society."

IN 1961

One month after the U.S. presidential election in 1960, the Soviets began supplying arms and ammunition to Communist forces in Laos by airlift out of Hanoi. By March 1961 Communists in battalion formations had launched a major offensive with heavy artillery, machineguns, mortars, and armored cars.

Former President Kennedy in a dramatic TV appearance on March 23 warned the Soviet Union that the United States "will not tolerate the loss of Laos to the Communists." He called for a neutral and independent country as pledged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman negotiated new agreements at Geneva supposedly guaranteeing the neutrality of Laos under a coalition government.

The Communists, however, continued to make gains. A State Department official said "The most important route for Communist reinforcements and supplies coming into South Vietnam is through Laos."

An international control commission including India, Canada, and Poland has never been allowed to function behind Communist lines in southeast Asia, any more than a similar neutral nations commission in Korea.

U.S. involvement in the war has grown steadily since late 1961 when advisory, support, and training units were sent to South Vietnam along with large amounts of military equipment. American troops began ferrying South Vietnamese units in airplanes and helicopters, giving them logistics and communications support, and guiding them in combat.

The "strategic hamlet" program was launched to fortify villages against hit-run attacks by Communist guerrillas.

IN 1962

Former President Kennedy told newsmen March 14 there were no U.S. combat troops in Vietnam. He said that if a constitutional decision were required on sending in American armed forces, "I would go to Congress."

Communist forces increased from 12,000 in 1961 to more than 20,000 men in 1962. McNamara said after a trip to Saigon that U.S. aid had enabled the Diem government to "take the offensive." General Taylor announced in Manila "the Vietnamese are on the road to victory."

Diem told his national assembly October 9 that South Vietnam, with 200,000 troops in the field, had "reversed" the advantages won by Communists in 1961. American correspondents, however, claimed the war was being lost, or would take years to win.

Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi promised to "outlast" American aid by keeping up guerrilla warfare for 10 years if necessary.

IN 1963

When a Buddhist religious controversy broke out in 1963, Kennedy appointed Lodge as his new envoy to Saigon, and hinted the United States might like a change in the Government of South Vietnam.

The Diem regime was overthrown in a military coup on November 1-2 when artillery and planes supplied by the United States for anti-Communist warfare attacked the presidential palace.

Meanwhile, President de Gaulle, of France, recognized Red China, and proposed that both North and South Vietnam be transformed into a unified, "neutral" state with French aid if the Vietnamese were prepared to throw off "foreign influence" wielded by the United States and Communist nations.

American officials reacted with anger and amazement. President Kennedy rejected the proposal, pledged the United States would not withdraw from South Vietnam until the Communist menace had been crushed. "After carrying this load for 18 years," he

said, "we are glad to get a little counsel, but we would like a little more assistance."

Returning from another inspection trip, McNamara and Taylor issued a White House statement saying "in their judgment, the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965." McNamara thought 1,000 American troops could be withdrawn by the end of 1964.

President Johnson assumed office on November 22. He met immediately afterward with Ambassador Lodge, pledged his administration would carry out U.S. policies toward Vietnam established by the Kennedy administration.

IN 1964

McNamara told Congress January 27 that the Communists had made "considerable progress" since the coup that overthrew the Diem regime. He reported the "new Government has more support than its predecessor." The new Government, or military junta, was overthrown in another coup on January 30.

President Johnson rejected the De Gaulle plan for neutrality as being against "the interests of freedom." He warned in a speech at Los Angeles February 21 that the suppliers and directors of Communists in South Vietnam were playing "a deeply dangerous game."

The State Department later sought to dispel reports that the administration was considering carrying the war to North Vietnam with the same guerrilla tactics the Communists are using in the south.

McNamara and Taylor returned from another trip to Saigon, lauded Premier Khanh for his "leadership and military ability," and pledged U.S. support for South Vietnam for "as long as it takes" to defeat the Communists.

The White House said that Khanh had produced "a sound central plan for prosecution of the war." Following a National Security Council meeting March 17, President Johnson announced the U.S. Government would send increased economic and military assistance to support the war plan of the new Premier.

That is where the situation stands today.

Eulogy of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Members in expressing my sorrow over the death of General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur. As one of the millions of American servicemen who served under General MacArthur during the Pacific campaigns of World War II, I have personal recollection of some of his greatest triumphs.

Certainly, in the proper judgment of military observers, General MacArthur has earned a place in history as one of our greatest military geniuses. His World War II strategy was almost flawless in its development and was especially noteworthy for the fact that his plan produced effective recovery of territory from the Japanese with a minimum loss of American lives.

We are all mindful of the frustrations to which General MacArthur was subjected during his command of the forces in the Korean war. He was one of the first victims of foreign policy decisions which

April 9

A1764

prevented clear-cut victory in the war against communism. The American people still remember his logical and dramatic emphasis on the fact that the purpose of war is victory.

Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur served our country in his military capacity for over 50 years, and his service was one of dedication, honor, courage, and, above all, triumphant accomplishments of American military forces.

A nation joins us in paying tribute to this great soldier. This Saturday when he is laid to his final rest, bugles will sound over his grave, and his soul will take its place at the head of a long line of heroes who have served our country so well.

Navy Creating Institute of Oceanography Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it was a real pleasure to learn recently that the U.S. Navy is creating an Institute of Naval Oceanology. Although it appears to be much less than the commitment this country should be making to the study of inner space, it is a step toward the type of oceanography program I had been advocating for some time.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a short article by Mr. John G. Norris, from the Los Angeles Times, which discusses the new Naval Institute of Oceanology in more detail:

NAVY CREATING INSTITUTE OF OCEANOGRAPHY STUDY

(By John G. Norris)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy is creating a Naval Institute of Oceanology here to speed the scientific and military development of inner space.

The Institute will coordinate research, development, and applications work in oceanography, which many believe should be pushed with the same vigor as the national space program.

There has been criticism in Congress and the scientific community about the fragmentation of effort in oceanography, and some have urged the establishment of an independent agency similar to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

RUSSIA PROGRAM

They declare that Russia has a larger oceanography program underway than the United States and cite the words of Soviet scientist G. V. Petrovich: "The nation which first learns to understand the seas will control them, and the nation which controls the seas will control the world."

The exploration and exploitation of the oceans could be of immense importance militarily—and perhaps even more as a source of food, water, minerals, and chemicals for the world's exploding population.

Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, the Navy oceanographer, disclosed the decision to set up the Naval Institute of Oceanology. Full details of the reorganization have not been worked out, but it clearly falls far short of being a "NASA for inner space."

The Government's oceanographic program, expanded greatly in recent years, is split between the Navy, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, Coast Guard, Geological Survey, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Public Health Service, Atomic Energy Commission, Smithsonian Institution and National Science Foundation.

An interagency committee on oceanography, operating under the White House office of science and technology, coordinates the program. Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development James H. Wakelin is chairman of the interagency committee.

COMBINATION PLAN

Wakelin, said Knoll in an interview, has directed that the Navy's oceanographic effort be pulled together in the new naval institute. For the present, it will informally combine the major portion of Knoll's oceanographic office with those activities of the office of naval research concerned with oceanography.

"We visualize the Naval Institute of Oceanology becoming the focal point of oceanographic effort for the Navy, other Government departments, scientific circles, and industry," said Knoll.

Whether such coordination of effort will satisfy those who want more centralized direction remains to be seen. But Navy officials feel that coordination rather than merger of activities is the best way to make progress.

U.S. Army School in Canal Zone Is Pro-Reds' Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Daily News was written by Clayton Willis who was recently in Panama. He describes the operations of the little-known School of the Americas there and I think Members would be interested in reading it:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 12, 1964]

U.S. ARMY SCHOOL IN CANAL ZONE IS PRO-REDS' TARGET

(By Clayton Willis)

FORT GULICK, C.Z.—The Panama Canal controversy has given the South American Reds, Fidelistas, Panamanian leftists, and Yankee haters in general an opportunity to make a propaganda target of a little publicized project called the School of the Americas.

After the recent riots, denunciations of the school appeared in Panama's newspapers.

The School of the Americas is operated in the Canal Zone. Uncle Sam has put a lot of money and brains into it. In a very real sense, it is a keystone in the military security of South American nations against armed subversion and revolution.

TRACH GUERRILLA WAR

Big role of the "school" is to teach Latin American military men techniques to fight successfully insurgency and guerrilla war. How well it does this can be judged by the fact that Fidel Castro is very unhappy about the existence of the school, and its site.

The Cuban leader and his Panamanian henchmen would like to see the present canal treaty torn up and a new one negotiated

which would reduce the U.S. control of the zone area, because, among other considerations, squeezing the United States out would squeeze out the school.

By and large, the School of the Americas and its activities are popular with Panamanians. For one thing, it pleases them that the school's instructors all must speak Spanish to teach the 31-odd courses.

FOUNDED IN 1949

The school occupies a sprawling piece of tropical, sunbathed land sandwiched in between lakes, canals and heavy jungle which, like the rest of the zone, is leased from the Republic of Panama.

It was founded in 1949. At first, it trained U.S. Army technicians but by 1963, emphasis had switched and 1,397 students who graduated were Latin Americans, while only 41 were from the U.S. Army.

Overall total up to December 31, 1963, is 14,903 Latin American students and more than 8,000 U.S. graduates. The Latin American graduate group includes 291 pre-Castro Cubans.

Says the U.S. commandant, Col. H. J. Muller, Jr., "Latin Americans from all countries come here. They exchange ideas. While their countries themselves might not always be on the best of terms with each other, their delegates here in the school mix well."

Intelligence value of the school is great, since it is an ideal chance for our people to meet and watch in action top military men from Latin America and can keep in touch with them as they move up through various commands in their own countries.

EXTENSIVE COURSES

Courses themselves vary from 2-week counterinsurgency courses to 40-week command, staff, and cadet courses, all aimed at establishing internal security and nation-building practices necessary to stamp out Communist-led and Communist-fed insurrections, including counterinsurgency operations, military intelligence, police work, command and staff training, infantry and jungle operations as well as paramilitary, political, sociological and psychological defense.

Here are the number of graduates, by countries:

Nicaragua, 2,729; Ecuador, 1,564; Costa Rica, 1,554; Panama, 1,347; Colombia, 1,321; Venezuela, 1,015; and several hundred from various other areas.

The Air Force Academy's First Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register on the "Air Force Academy's First Decade":

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY'S FIRST DECADE

Ten years ago on 1 April 1954 President Eisenhower signed the legislation authorizing establishment of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

In that short time, this newest of service academies was set up and has graduated five classes. Even before its first class was graduated in 1959, USAFA won academic accreditation as an institution of higher learning by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

It lists among its other accomplishments: